

REMARKS

Applicants have thoroughly considered the January 23, 2007 Office action. This Amendment A amends claims 1-3, 9, 23-45, and 48 to more clearly set forth the invention. Applicants respectfully request that favorable reconsideration of the application in light of the amendments and following remarks. The specification is amended to correct minor typographical error. No new matter is added.

As a preliminary matter, Applicants request the Examiner to indicate whether the drawings submitted on July 9, 2003 have been accepted.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 23-44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants have amended claims to recite a computer-readable storage medium to further clarify the scope of the invention, and that the embodiments of the invention as claimed in claims 23-44 produce a concrete, useful, and tangible result in the computer-readable storage medium. As such, Applicants request the rejection of claims 23-44 under 35 U.S.C. §101 should be withdrawn.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1-50 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Chasen et al. (US Patent No. 6,760,721). Applicants submit that Chasen fails to disclose or suggest each and every element of the independent claims 1, 9, 23, 31, 45 and 48 as amended.

For example, claim 1 is amended to recite, in part,

“in response to the associating, providing options to a user for modifying or supplementing the property data of the selected media file as a function of the property category data; receiving a user response to the provided options; and modifying or supplementing the metadata field of the selected media file to the different property defined by the property category data in response to the user response.”

Embodiments of the invention provide convenient and intelligent methods to make changes to metadata. Aspects of the invention not only allow users to associate, such as via drag-and-drop operations, media files with a property node, but also provide

options in response to such association. For example, as described at least in paragraph 31 and FIG. 3A, a user may first select a media object, such as an icon representing a music file. The music file has metadata associated therewith, and one of the metadata includes genre information. The music file may be originally classified under “Rap” genre category. The user may next drag the media object to a genre category “Rock” and drop the object at the “Rock” genre category. Instead of merely and automatically execute such “drag-and-drop” operation, embodiments of the invention **provide options to the user for modifying or supplementing** the metadata of the music file **as a function of the different property**, such as the new “Rock” genre category. Using the example above, a context menu may appear in response to this associating action (i.e., drag-and-drop) and provides options, such as “Change Genre” or “Add Genre” so that the user has choices in configuring or changing the metadata.

In another instance, the media file may have what appears to be a misspelling, but may have a particular meaning to the user for other purpose, such as personalized categories, or the like. For example, suppose a media file has a genre property metadata as “Rck.” However, there is also a “Rock” genre category. When the user associates this media file with the “Rock” genre category, in this instance, the provided options to the user may be “Correct spelling” or “Add Genre.” See also paragraph 35. By providing options to the user in response to such associating operation, the user beneficially has a richer user experience in that the user is allowed to choose how to best proceed with a rather frequently-used operation depending on the property of the dropped object, (i.e., the “Rock” genre category example above). See also paragraph 28-30 for additional subject matter support for the above amendment.

To the contrary, Chasen teaches away from amended claim 1 because Chasen specifically discloses and suggests that the dragged object “will inherit the characteristics of the new grouping” – the dropped object. Chasen, col. 15, lines 20-23. Furthermore, “[f]or example, a user may reclassify a song from the genre Jazz to the genre New Age by using a mouse to drag the song from the Jazz node to the New Age node.” Chasen, col. 15, lines 10-13. See also FIG. 5 of Chasen. Chasen further discloses that, in response to the above data change process, the database collection 230, (e.g., the metadata database 232 of Chasen) proceeds to make changes in the database. In other words, the user has no options or selections to perform operations

other than the operation hard-coded by Chasen. Moreover, Chasen merely discloses that the metadata may be modified, but not supplemented. Therefore, Chasen cannot anticipate claim 1.

Hence, Applicants submit that Chasen does not disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 1 as amended. Thus, claim 1 is allowable over the cited art and claims depending from claim 1 are also allowable. Applicants hereby requests the rejection of claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) be withdrawn.

Amended claim 9 recites, in part:

"in response to the associating, providing options to the user for modifying or supplementing the selected property category data of the media file as a function of the different property category data; receiving a user response to the provided options; and modifying or supplementing the property data in the metadata field of the one or more media files having the property defined by the property category data to the different property defined by the different property category data in response to the user response."

Because Chasen is silent about and teaches away from providing options to the user in response to associating a media file with a property node, Applicants submit that Chasen cannot anticipate claim 9 as amended. Therefore, the rejection of claims 9-22 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) should be withdrawn.

Similarly, claims 23, 31, 45 and 48 are amended to recite similar feature of "**in responsive to associating, providing options to a user for modifying or supplementing the selected property category data of the media file (or property data of the selected media file) as a function of the different property category data (or the property category data); receiving a user response to the provided options; and in responsive to the received user response to modify or supplement the metadata field (or the property data in the metadata field) of the one or more media files having the property defined by the selected property category data to the different property.**" For at least the reasons above, amended claims 23, 31, 45 and 48 are allowable because Chasen fails to disclose or suggest at least the feature above. Therefore, the rejection of claims 23-50 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) should be withdrawn.

Although the prior art made of record and not relied upon may be considered pertinent to the disclosure, none of these references anticipates or makes obvious the recited invention. The prior art made of record fails to disclose presenting or providing options to a user for modifying or supplementing the metadata in response to the associating.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that independent claims 1, 9, 23, 31, 45 and 48 are allowable over the cited art. The claims depending from these claims are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims from which they depend.

It is felt that a full and complete response has been made to the Office action and, as such, places the application in condition for allowance. Such allowance is hereby respectfully requested. The fact that the Applicant may not have specifically traversed any particular assertion by the Office should not be construed as indicating Applicants' agreement therewith.

The Applicant wishes to expedite prosecution of this application. If the Examiner deems the application as amended to not be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited and encouraged to telephone the undersigned to discuss making an Examiner's amendment to place the application in condition for allowance.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency or overpayment of any required fee during the entire pendency of this application to Deposit Account No. 19-1345.

Respectfully submitted,

/TAN-CHI YUAN/

Tan-Chi Yuan, Limited Recognition, No. L0113
SENNIGER POWERS
One Metropolitan Square, 16th Floor
St. Louis, Missouri 63102
(314) 231-5400

FRA/ATY/tmg

Via EFS